

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/798,286	03/12/2004	Kenneth E. Davis	DA V001-082	5177
	7590 01/14/2008 nts Company MD 0750		EXAMI	INER
500 Renaissance	e Drive Suite 102		<u> </u>	MARC E
St. Joseph, MI	49085		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3744	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/14/2008	PAPER.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		\mathcal{U}	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/798,286	DAVIS ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marc E. Norman	3744	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address -	-
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNI CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI statute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communical BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u>17 December 2007</u> .		
	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for a	llowance except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits	is
closed in accordance with the practice ur	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I). 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-18 and 20 is/are pending in th	e application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	thdrawn from consideration.		
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-18 and 20</u> is/are allowed.		,	
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 10</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) 7-9 is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.	•	
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2004 is/	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ ob	jected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	to the drawing(s) be held in abeya	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c	· ·		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by t	he Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152.	•
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority docu		antication No	
2. Certified copies of the priority docu3. Copies of the certified copies of the			
application from the International B		received in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for	•	received.	
Attachment(s)	_		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 	5) Notice of	nformal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🗌 Other:	.	

10/798,286 Art Unit: 3744

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see REMARKS/ARGUMENTS, filed 12/17/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under 35 USC 102 and 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further search and consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hu et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hu et al.

As per claim 1, Hu et al. discloses a refrigerator comprising a cabinet with a fresh food compartment and a freezer compartment, a passage/damper between the compartments (mullion damper 200), a refrigeration system including evaporator fan 214 and air stirring fan 212 operable at variable speeds (Figure 2), plurality of sensors (172, 174, 176, 178), and control system (Figures 2-7) controlling the damper position (step 264), the speed of the compressor

Application/Control Number:

10/798,286 Art Unit: 3744

219, speed of the evaporator fan 214, speed of the stirring fan 212 based on the sensors (Figures 2 and 3B).

As per claim 2, Hu et al. discloses freezer compartment temperature sensor 246.

As per claims 3 and 4, Hu et al. discloses varying compressor speed based on freezer temperature and freezer target temperature (see vertical axis of Figure 5, which incorporates both freezer temperature and freezer target temperature).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 5, 6, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hu et al.

As per claims 5 and 6, Hu et al. teaches freezer compartment sensor 176, evaporator sensor 178, fresh food compartment sensor 172. Hue et al. does not teach an ambient

temperature sensor. However, the use of ambient temperature sensors in conjunction with refrigerators is generally old and well known in the art. Further, Applicant's claim does not specifically state that the control algorithm uses all of the sensors, but rather it uses data from the group as a whole. Accordingly, it does not require that the algorithm must use data from an ambient temperature sensor, rather only that an ambient temperature sensor be present. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add an ambient temperature sensor to the system of Hu et al. for a whole variety of purposes completely unrelated to the claimed control algorithm (see for example outside temperature sensor 62 of Temmyo et al.). Official notice is further taken that it would have been obvious to place the sensor near the inlet of the condenser since this is where the system interfaces with the outside.

As per claim 10, official notice is taken that it is generally well known and an obvious matter of engineering design choice to place the refrigerant system above the cabinet shell.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 11-18 and 20 are allowed.

Conclusion

10/798,286

Art Unit: 3744

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc E. Norman whose telephone number is 571-272-4812. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on 571-272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MN

MARC NORMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER